

The China Mail.

Established February, 1846.

The China Mail.

VOL. XLIV. No. 8039.

號八月十年八十八百八千英

HONGKONG, MONDAY, OCTOBER 8, 1888.

日四初月九年子戊

PRICE, \$2 PER MONTH.

AGENTS FOR THE CHINA MAIL.

LONDON.—F. ALGAR, 11 & 12, Clement's Lane, Lombard Street, E. C. GEORGE STREET & Co., 30, Cornhill. GORDON & GOTCH, Ludgate Circus, E.C. BATES HENRY & Co., 37, Walbrook, E.C. SAMUEL DEACON & Co., 150 & 154, Leadenhall Street, W. M. WILLS, 151, Cannon Street, E.C.

PARIS AND EUROPE.—ANDRE PRINCE & Co., 36, Rue Lafayette, Paris.

NEW YORK.—ANDREW WIND, 21, Park Row.

SAN FRANCISCO AND AMERICAN PORTS generally.—BROWN & BLACK, San Francisco.

AUSTRALIA, TASMANIA, AND NEW ZEALAND.—GORDON & GORDON, Melbourne and Sydney.

CYERON.—W. M. SMITH & Co., THE APOTHECARY CO., Colombo.

SINGAPORE, STRAITS, &c.—SAVILE & Co., Square, Singapore. O. HEINZEN & Co., Manila.

CHINA.—MAGNUS, F. A. DE CRUZ, Macau, Quilon, &c. AMY, N. MOALLE, Macao, HEEBEI, &c. SHANGHAI, LANE, CRAWFORD & Co., and KELLY & WALSH, YOKOHAMA, LANE, CRAWFORD & Co., and KELLY & Co.

BANKS.

NOTICE.

RULES OF THE HONGKONG SAVINGS' BANK.

1.—The business of the above Bank will be conducted by the Hongkong and Shanghai Banking Corporation, on their premises in Hongkong. Business hours on week-days, 10 to 3; Saturdays, 10 to 1.

2.—Sums less than \$1, or more than \$250 at one time will not be received. No depositor may deposit more than \$2,500 in any one year.

3.—Depositors in the Savings' Bank having \$100 or more at their credit may at their option transfer the same to the Hongkong and Shanghai Banking Corporation on fixed deposit for 12 months at 5 per cent. per annum interest.

4.—Interest at the rate of 3½ per cent. per annum will be allowed to depositors on their daily balances.

5.—Each Depositor will be supplied gratis with a Pass-Book which must be presented with each payment or withdrawal. Depositors must not make any entries themselves in their Pass-Books but should send them to be written up at least twice a year, about the beginning of January and beginning of July.

6.—Correspondence as to the business of the Bank if marked On Hongkong Savings' Bank Business is forwarded free by the various British Post Offices in Hongkong and China.

7.—Withdrawals may be made on demand, but the personal attendance of the depositor or his duly appointed agent, and the production of his Pass-Book are necessary.

For the HONGKONG & SHANGHAI BANKING CORPORATION.
T. JACKSON,
Chief Manager.

Hongkong, September 1, 1888. 754
HONGKONG & SHANGHAI BANKING CORPORATION.

PAID-UP CAPITAL, \$7,500,000
RESERVE FUND, \$4,000,000
RESERVE LIABILITY OF PRO. \$7,500,000
PROPRIETORS, \$7,500,000

COUNCIL OF DIRECTORS.
Chairman—HOD JOHN BELL-JAYING.
Deputy Chairman—W. H. FOWLER, Esq.
C. D. BOTOMLEY, S. C. MICHAELSEN,
Esq.
W. G. BODIE, Esq.
H. L. DALMIPPLE, L. F. FONZIEK, Esq.
N. A. SIES, Esq.
E. A. SOLOMON, Esq.
Hon. B. LATTON.

Chief Manager.
Hongkong,.....THOMAS JACKSON, Esq.
Manager.
Shanghai,.....EVER CAMERON, Esq.
LONDON BANKERS.—London and County Bank.

HONGKONG.
INTEREST ALLOWED.
ON Current Deposit Account at the rate of 2 per cent. per annum on the daily balance.

ON Fixed Deposits:
For 3 months, 3 per cent. per annum.
" 6 " 4 per cent. " "
" 12 " 5 per cent. " "

LOCAL BILLS DISCOUNTED.
Credits granted on approved Securities, and every description of Banking and Exchange business transacted.

Drafts granted on London, and the chief Commercial places in Europe, India, Australia, America, China and Japan.

T. JACKSON,
Chief Manager.
Hongkong, September 4, 1888. 363

Intimations.

SHANGHAI, 21st Sept., 1888.

FROM the First November next, the SHANGHAI BUTCHERY will be prepared to SUPPLY BRAIN, LARD in Bladder, Fresh and Pickled ENGLISH PORK SAUSAGES, &c.

Also, BEEF in Joints and Corned, Black PUDDINGS, PORK and GAMES PIES. 1654 S. R. GALE.

NOTICE.

HONGKONG AND WHAMPOA DOCK COMPANY, LIMITED.

SHIPMASTERS and ENGINEERS are respectfully informed that if upon their arrival in this Harbour, NONE of the Company's FOREMEN should be at hand, Orders for REPAIRS if sent to the HEAD OFFICE, No. 14, Praya Central, will receive prompt attention.

In the Event of Complaints being found necessary, Communication with the Undersigned is requested, when immediate steps will be taken to rectify the cause of dissatisfaction.

D. GILLIES,
Secretary.
Hongkong, August 23, 1888. 1458

Intimations.



TENDERS will be Received by the Undersigned on or before the 16th Instant, for the SUPPLY of GROUND-NUT OIL to H. M. NAVAL YARD.

Each Tender is to be accompanied by a sample or samples of Oil to be supplied.

W. H. LOBB,
Naval Storekeeper.

H. M. Naval Yard,
October 6th, 1888. 1681

MOORE'S GOGO SHAMPOO WASH.

THIS WASH HAS PROVED ITSELF TO BE THE BEST PREPARATION EVER PRESENTED TO THE PUBLIC.

THE Bases of this compound is made of Gogo Root. The natives of the Philippines Islands never use anything else for washing their hair; you never see them bald, and it is quite common to see the females with hair from 5 to 6 feet long. By using this SHAMPOO WASH as directed, you will never be bald. The Proprietor offers the Wash to the public, being entirely confident that by its restorative properties it will surely arrest decaying hair, completely eradicate scurf, dandruff, and cure all diseases of the scalp; it does not contain any poisonous drug, but, by its cooling properties allies the itching and fever of the scalp.

CAMPBELL, MOORE & Co., Ltd.,
Under Hongkong Hotel.
Hongkong, May 17, 1888. 810

THE HONGKONG HIGH LEVEL TRAMWAYS COMPANY, LIMITED.

THE Public are respectfully informed that the PEAK TRAMWAY was OPENED for PUBLIC TRAFFIC on WEDNESDAY, 30th May.

WEEK DAYS.
The CARS RUN as follows between St. JOHN'S PLACE and VICTORIA GAP:—
8 to 10 a.m. every quarter of an hour.
12 " 2 p.m. half hour.
4 " 8 " quarter of an hour.
DOWN CARS between 8 and 10 a.m. for First-class Passengers only.

SUNDAYS.
1 past 12 to 6 past one every quarter of an hour, and from 4 to 8 p.m. every quarter of an hour.

Single Tickets are sold in the Cars; Five-Cent Coupons and Reduced Tickets at the Office of

MAEWEEN, FRICKEL & Co., General Managers.

VICTORIA EXCHANGE,
50 & 52 Queen's Road,
Hongkong, September 15, 1888. 1254

CHAS. J. GAUPP & Co., Chronometer, Watch & Clock Makers, Jewelers, Gold & Silversmiths.

NAUTICAL, SCIENTIFIC AND METEOROLOGICAL INSTRUMENTS.

VOGLANDER'S CELEBRATED BINOCULARS AND TELESCOPES.

RICHARD'S LIQUID AND OTHER COMPASSES, ADMIRALTY & IMRAY CHARTS, NAUTICAL BOOKS.

English SILVER & ELECTRO-PLATEDWARE, Christofle & Co.'s ELECTRO-PLATEDWARE, GOLD & SILVER JEWELLERY in great variety.

DIAMONDS

DIAMOND JEWELLERY, A Splendid Collection of the Latest London PATTERNS, at very moderate prices. 742

A POLLINARI'S WATER.

Per Case of.....4 doz. Pints \$6.00
Do.4 " Quarts 3.00

ALLOWANCE FOR EMPTY BOTTLES WHEN RETURNED.

\$1.33.....per 100.....Pints.

2.66.....per 100.....Quarts.

GALDBECK, MACGREGOR & Co., Sole Agents for HONGKONG AND CHINA.

PEPPER'S STREET,
Hongkong, October 4, 1888. 1660

NOTICE.

JEVYE'S SANITARY COMPOUNDS COMPANY, LIMITED.

THE Undersigned have This Day been appointed SOLE AGENTS for the Sale of these PERFECT DISINFECTANTS, and are prepared to supply quantities to suit Purchasers, at Wholesale Prices. Extra special terms for Shipping and large orders.

W. G. HUMPHREYS & Co., Bank Buildings, Hongkong, October 1, 1888. 1662

NOTICE.

COLLEGE OF MEDICINE FOR CHINESE.

RESIDENTS in the Colony would materially aid the SENATE of the COLLEGE by forwarding to the AMERICAN HOSPITAL

(1). Glass Jars (for museum purposes).

(2). Illustrated Papers and Books for the Student's Reading Room and Library.

Address to

JAMES CANTLIE,
Hon. Sec. to the College.

Hongkong, August 7, 1888. 1317

HONGKONG & SHANGHAI BANKING CORPORATION,

OLD OR BROKEN NOTES will be EXCHANGED for NEW ONES on application at the Offices of the Corporation.

For the HONGKONG & SHANGHAI BANKING CORPORATION,

T. JACKSON,
Chief Manager.

Hongkong, August 30, 1888. 1443

Business Notices.



NEW AUTUMN AND WINTER STOCK.

GENTLEMEN'S OUTFITTING DEPARTMENT.

TAILORING.—The newest Materials for DRESS SUITS, MORNING SUITS and JACKETS, Trousers, Thin and Thick Materials for OVER and ULSTER COATS, COAT COATINGS. A Complete Selection of Materials for BREECHES and RIDING TROUSERS, Fancy CASHMERE and WASHING VESTS, SERGES in all Colors and Subtances, Fancy FLANNELS for SUITS, Fancy STITCHED CHICKING and TENNIS PLAINES, New FANCY CLOTHES.

UNDERWEAR and PANTS in MERINO, ANGORA, CASHMERE, LAMA-WOOL, LLAMA-WOOL, SILK, &c. PANTS specially adapted for RIDING, HALF-HOSE.

LLAMA-WOOL, SILK, &c. PANTS specially adapted for RIDING, HALF-HOSE.

LLAMA-WOOL, SILK, &c. PANTS specially adapted for RIDING, HALF-HOSE.

LLAMA-WOOL, SILK, &c. PANTS specially adapted for RIDING, HALF-HOSE.

LLAMA-WOOL, SILK, &c. PANTS specially adapted for RIDING, HALF-HOSE.

LLAMA-WOOL, SILK, &c. PANTS specially adapted for RIDING, HALF-HOSE.

LLAMA-WOOL, SILK, &c. PANTS specially adapted for RIDING, HALF-HOSE.

LLAMA-WOOL, SILK, &c. PANTS specially adapted for RIDING, HALF-HOSE.

LLAMA-WOOL, SILK, &c. PANTS specially adapted for RIDING, HALF-HOSE.

LLAMA-WOOL, SILK, &c. PANTS specially adapted for RIDING, HALF-HOSE.

LLAMA-WOOL, SILK, &c. PANTS specially adapted for RIDING, HALF-HOSE.

LLAMA-WOOL, SILK, &c. PANTS specially adapted for RIDING, HALF-HOSE.

LLAMA-WOOL, SILK, &c. PANTS specially adapted for RIDING, HALF-HOSE.

LLAMA-WOOL, SILK, &c. PANTS specially adapted for RIDING, HALF-HOSE.

LLAMA-WOOL, SILK, &c. PANTS specially adapted for RIDING, HALF-HOSE.

LLAMA-WOOL, SILK, &c. PANTS specially adapted for RIDING, HALF-HOSE.

LLAMA-WOOL, SILK, &c. PANTS specially adapted for RIDING, HALF-HOSE.

LLAMA-WOOL, SILK, &c. PANTS specially adapted for RIDING, HALF-HOSE.

LLAMA-WOOL, SILK, &c. PANTS specially adapted for RIDING, HALF-HOSE.

LLAMA-WOOL, SILK, &c. PANTS specially adapted for RIDING, HALF-HOSE.

LLAMA-WOOL, SILK, &c. PANTS specially adapted for RIDING, HALF-HOSE.

LLAMA-WOOL, SILK, &c. PANTS specially adapted for RIDING, HALF-HOSE.

LLAMA-WOOL, SILK, &c. PANTS specially adapted for RIDING, HALF-HOSE.

LLAMA-WOOL, SILK, &c. PANTS specially adapted for RIDING, HALF-HOSE.

LLAMA-WOOL, SILK, &c. PANTS specially adapted for RIDING, HALF-HOSE.

LLAMA-WOOL, SILK, &c. PANTS specially adapted for RIDING, HALF-HOSE.

LLAMA-WOOL, SILK, &c. PANTS specially adapted for RIDING, HALF-HOSE.

LLAMA-WOOL, SILK, &c. PANTS specially adapted for RIDING, HALF-HOSE.

LLAMA-WOOL, SILK, &c. PANTS specially adapted for RIDING, HALF-HOSE.

INSURANCES.

NORTH BRITISH & MERCANTILE INSURANCE COMPANY.
The Undersigned, Agents of the above Company, are authorized to insure against FIRE at Current Rates.

GILMAN & CO.

Hongkong, January 1, 1882. 14

THE LONDON ASSURANCE.

INCORPORATED BY ROYAL CHARTER OF His Majesty King George The First, A. D. 1720.

THE Undersigned having been appointed Agents for the above Corporation are prepared to grant Insurances as follows:—

Marine Department.

Policies at current rates, payable either here, in London, or at the principal Ports of India, China and Australia.

Fire Department.

Policies issued for sums not exceeding £5,000 at reduced rates.

HOLLIDAY, WISE & CO.

Hongkong, July 26, 1872. 496

QUEEN FIRE INSURANCE COMPANY.

THE Undersigned, Agents for the above Company, are prepared to ACCEPT RISKS against FIRE at Current Rates.

NORTON & CO., Agents.

Hongkong, July 15, 1887. 1340

To-day's Advertisements.

OCEAN STEAMSHIP COMPANY.

FOR SHANGHAI VIA AMOY.

(Taking Cargo & Passengers at through rates for NINGPO, CHEROO, NEW-CHWANG, TIENTSIN, HANKOW and Ports on the YANGTSE.)

The Co.'s Steamship Nestor, Capt. THOMPSON, will be despatched as above on WEDNESDAY, the 10th Instant, at Day-light.

For Freight or Passage, apply to BUTTERFIELD & SWIRE Agents.

Hongkong, October 8, 1888. 1651

THE SCOTTISH ORIENTAL STEAMSHIP COMPANY, LIMITED.

FOR BANGKOK (DIRECT).

The Company's Steamer Kong Beng, Capt. R. JONES, will be despatched for the above Port on WEDNESDAY, the 10th Instant, at Noon.

For Freight or Passage, apply to YUEN FAT HONG, Agents.

Hongkong, October 8, 1888. 1653

THE GIRB LINE OF STEAMERS.

FOR SYDNEY AND MELBOURNE, VIA FOOCHOW.

(Calling at QUEENSLAND PORTS, and taking through cargo for ADELAIDE, TASMANIA, NEW ZEALAND, &c.)

The British Steamship Tarar, Captain BAILEY, will be despatched as above on WEDNESDAY, the 10th Instant, at 4 p.m.

Attention is directed to this Steamer's comfortable Saloon and State Rooms, affording excellent accommodation for First-class Passengers.

Fare to SYDNEY or MELBOURNE, \$150.

For Freight or Passage, apply to GIBB, LIVINGSTON & CO., Managers.

Hongkong, October 8, 1888. 1657

THE GIBB LINE OF STEAMERS.

FOR SYDNEY AND MELBOURNE, via SINGAPORE AND JAVA.

(Taking through cargo for ADELAIDE, TASMANIA, NEW ZEALAND, &c.)

The British Steamer Ghazee, Captain SCOTTISH, will be quick despatched for the above Ports.

Attention is directed to this steamer's comfortable Saloon and State Rooms, affording excellent accommodation for First-class Passengers.

Fare to Sydney or Melbourne, \$150.

For Freight or Passage, apply to GIBB, LIVINGSTON & CO., Managers.

Hongkong, October 8, 1888. 1658

DOUGLAS STEAMSHIP COMPANY, LIMITED.

FOR SWATOW, AMOY & FOOCHOW.

The Co.'s Steamship Hainan, Captain ASHTON, will be despatched for the above Ports on FRIDAY, the 12th Instant, at Noon.

For Freight or Passage, apply to DOUGLAS LAPRAIK & CO., General Managers.

Hongkong, October 8, 1888. 1690

NOTICE TO SHAREHOLDERS.

THE Seventh Ordinary General MEETING OF SHAREHOLDERS will be held at the Office of the Undersigned at 12 o'clock (noon) on SATURDAY, the 27th October instant.

The Transfer BOOKS of the Company will be CLOSED from the 13th to the 27th instant, both days inclusive.

JARDINE, MATHESON & CO., General Agents.

CANTON INSURANCE OFFICE, LIMITED.

Hongkong, October 8, 1888. 1692

THE CHINA SHIPPERS MUTUAL STEAM NAVIGATION COMPANY, LIMITED.

NOTICE TO CONSIGNEES.

FROM GLASGOW, LIVERPOOL, AND SINGAPORE.

THE Company's S.S. Kaison, having arrived from the above Ports, Consignees of Cargo are hereby informed that their Goods are being landed at their risk into the Godowns of the HONGKONG and KOWLOON WHARF AND GODOWNS COMPANY, LIMITED, Kowloon, whence delivery may be obtained.

No Claims will be admitted after all Goods have left the Godowns, and all Claims must be sent in to the Office of the Undersigned, before Noon on the 13th instant, or they will not be recognized.

No Fire Insurance has been effected, and any Goods remaining in the Godowns after the 13th instant will be subject to rent.

Optional Cargo will be forwarded unless notice to the contrary be given before 10 o'clock To-day.

Bills of Lading will be countersigned by ARNHELD, KARBERG & CO., Agents.

Hongkong, October 8, 1888. 1692

INDO-CHINA STEAM NAVIGATION COMPANY, LIMITED.

FROM CALCUTTA, PENANG AND SINGAPORE.

THE Company's S.S. Wingsung, having arrived from the above Ports, Consignees of Cargo by her are hereby informed that their Goods are being landed at their risk into the Godowns of the HONGKONG and KOWLOON WHARF AND GODOWNS CO., Ltd., at West Point, whence delivery may be obtained.

Cargo remaining undelivered after the 14th instant will be subject to rent.

No Fire Insurance has been effected.

Consignees are also requested to present all Claims for damages and/or shortfalls not later than the 20th instant, otherwise they will not be recognized.

Bills of Lading will be countersigned by JARDINE, MATHESON & CO., General Managers.

Hongkong, October 8, 1888. 1693

FOR YOKOHAMA AND HIOGO.

The Steamship Lydia, Capt. G. PETERSEN, will be despatched for the above Ports on WEDNESDAY, the 10th instant, at 4 p.m., instead of as previously notified.

For Freight or Passage, apply to SIEMSEN & CO., Agents.

Hongkong, October 8, 1888. 1693

SHIPPING.

ARRIVALS.

October 7, 1888.—Kwongkang, British steamer, from Whampoa.

Carrier Dore, British barque, 1,026, A. Forsyth, Kobe September 16, General—CAPTAIN.

Fukien, British steamer, 509, J. Lewis, Tamai October 4, and Amoy 6, General—DOUGLAS STEAMSHIP CO.

Nestor, British steamer, 1,203, J. S. Thompson, London via Peiping, and Singapoer October 1, General.—BUTTERFIELD & SWIRE.

Actis, Danish steamer, 355, N. C. Revell, Pakhoi and Hoitow October 6, General—ARNHOLD, KARBERG & CO.

Diamond, British steamer, 514, Cobban, Manila October 5, General—RUSSELL & CO.

Wingsung, British steamer, 1,517, A. de St. Croix, Calcutta September 21, General—JARDINE, MATHESON & CO.

Thymus, German steamer, 674, P. Moon, Madla October 3, Sugar—Witzel & Co.

October 8.—Chow-chow-foo, German steamer, from Whampoa.

Asturie, German str., 400, John Samuel, Pakhoi and Hoitow October 7, General—WIELER & CO.

Visaya, Spanish steamer, 406, D. Juan Ajubita, Amoy October 4, General—Bar Kuson.

DEPARTURES.

October 7.—Fidzzi, for Tientsin.

Electra, for Singapore and Hamburg.

Nanota, for Cost Ports.

Hector, for Shanghai.

Piccola, for China.

October 8.—Pia Chua Chon Kiao, for Swatow.

Melita, for Binhai.

Sedalis, British cruiser, for a cruise.

Yangtze, for Shanghai.

Taiyuan, for Auckland and Wellington.

Kuson, for Shanghai.

CLEARED.

Goliath, for Bangkok.

Fook Ching, for Foochow.

Pokien, for Cost Ports.

Frey, for Touren.

Augusta, for Ilolo.

PASSAGERS.

ARRIVED.

Per Nestor, from Singapore, 80 Chinese.

Per Fokien, for Tamsui, Captain and Mrs.

Hongkong, October 8, 1888. 1693

MEMOS. FOR TO-MORROW.

Shipping.

Daylight.—Police leaves for T'ow, & Co.

Noon.—Moyne leaves for London.

4 p.m.—Diananu leaves for Manila, &c.

DEPARTED.

For Electra, for Singapore, 1 European,

and 12 Chinese.

For Phra Chula Chom Kiao, for Swatow,

4 Europeans, and 200 Chinese.

For Melita, for Hoitow, 150 Chinese.

For Yangtze, for Shanghai, 5 Chinese.

For Taiyuan, for Auckland, &c., 2 Europeans.

For Namou, for Swatow, Mrs. Pullock,

nurse and 4 children, Messrs. Chu Choon

Khing, Mackenzie, W. C. Kuhmeyer and

Captain Williams; for Amoy, Messrs. F.

Hempel, A. J. Cross, and Mrs. Harmon.

To DEPART.

For Fokien, for Foochow, 4 Chinese.

For L'Avant, for Mantung, 9 Chinese.

For Pokien, for Cost Ports, 1 European,

and 100 Chinese.

For Frey, for Touren, 60 Chinese.

To DEPART.

For Fokien, for Foochow, 4 Chinese.

For L'Avant, for Mantung, 9 Chinese.

For Pokien, for Cost Ports, 1 European,

and 100 Chinese.

For Frey, for Touren, 60 Chinese.

To DEPART.

For Fokien, for Foochow, 4 Chinese.

For L'Avant, for Mantung, 9 Chinese.

For Pokien, for Cost Ports, 1 European,

and 100 Chinese.

For Frey, for Touren, 60 Chinese.

To DEPART.

For Fokien, for Foochow, 4 Chinese.

For L'Avant, for Mantung, 9 Chinese.

For Pokien, for Cost Ports, 1 European,

and 100 Chinese.

For Frey, for Touren, 60 Chinese.

<p

both by assay and practical test it is proved to be far below the most modest computations formerly given you of its value. Assaying only 2 cts., it returns only half of a pennyweight by amalgamation, whilst rather more than another half penny-weight per ton is saved in the concentrates, which however have not yet all been collected. Of the richer sample the figures are not yet to hand, but I expect at least to get several pennyweights to the ton as the 50 tons of ore treated assayed 8 dwt., and the quartz was considerably mixed with barren rock. This sample was mixed by the Chinese tributaries and first washed by them in their ground sluices, from which they are now cleaning up. The hard rock thrown out of the sluice, amounting to nearly 30 tons, was melted by 4 head of stamps in 6 days of 11 hrs. From the amalgam I hope to get 2 or 3 dwt. per ton, and at least an equal amount in the aridical concentrates, which when totalled with the Chinese returns will not be unsatisfactory, especially as the work was managed by the tributaries on very advantageous terms for us.

The Chairman.—The Chinese take the few gold and we got a share of it, a portion of which in a small nugget here to begin with (about a nugget of gold). Our object will now be to get samples of still better quartz by carefully following and selecting the veins which are known to be richest, and whilst we are doing this it will be advisable to keep the mill shut down for a few weeks. The development in the open cast mines can proceed but slowly in the absence of all deep-mining machinery. We shall have to move the little 4-in. centrifugal to pump a few feet deeper, and depend on a 2-in. squirt-like toy to drain the deep incline in the cross hole. Though with such appliances and the absence of any development underground we cannot expect to keep the mill constantly supplied, I still hope to accomplish within the next two months my allotted task of proving the mine to contain, and the mill to be able to treat, such ore as will warrant extended exploration and deep mining. In compliance with your request I shall shortly arrange to pay a visit to Sungie Dua, where Mr. Scaife has I believe turned out and smelted some quantity of tin, and though I am presently uninformed by him I hope soon to put you in possession of all matters relating to this late experiment in stream tin mining. I may mention that I have lately prospected some spots presently unworked but in the immediate vicinity of these mines, where both alluvial and quartz are auriferous and of promising appearance. Though loathe to incur further outside expenditure I am of opinion that it would be worth while to do something towards examining and testing these places, as in the event of Punjung becoming the confirmed success which promises to be, they would be readily taken up on lease or purchase by other parties, whilst in the meantime they may prove sources of profitable work at any time to ourselves.

We have got eight miles of property, it would be a Herculean task to work one tenth. I think Becher's suggestion is very sensible. If it is to be the success that we seem to think the sooner he gets men the better. We have hesitated and even now we hesitate to launch in this in any other direction until we are more convinced as to the immediate financial future.

Mr. Becher continues.—It is also a policy which I cannot too strongly urge for all mines to be constantly allowing a certain proportion of expenditure to exploration, so that in the failure of known sources of supply other and newer ones may in all probability be discovered.

Our first small bar of bullion went forward a few days ago, to be followed I trust by many more of greater weight. All the concentrates which we can collect shall be sent out of the country before the post closes. Hoping to give you more conclusive reports of better returns shortly, I remain gentle- men &c.

The Chairman (continuing).—This is not altogether so conclusive as we had wished for, but I think the gentleman present will admit that we have a business man representing us down there. This latter allows him an intimate and intelligent knowledge of his work and that he is to be trusted (Applause). Some of us have had some experience of him for a good many years, and we have never had occasion to doubt his trustworthiness, and that is two-thirds of the battle. If I really did not think a much of him as I did in that respect I would almost hesitate to advise the extension of the work and the outlay of any other capital. As it is I should scarcely think there is much fear about it. However I am only indicating the necessity of fresh capital. In the meantime it is not our purpose to propose it. Notice has been given of this. If fresh capital is required and has to be raised it will have to be done at a meeting called for the purpose. You know all we know about the whole business, you must just come to your own conclusions. Before passing the accounts, I should be glad to answer any questions.

Mr. Coughtrie.—I suppose you have written to reassure the manager about this that it will be at his disposal for the next four months.

The Chairman.—Oh yes, we have got the money in hand to go on with for the next six months as we are going on now, in full operation. Of course it would not be judicious for the Company to go on till the last red cent was gone, and hence we should have to give notice now to bring things to a standstill in a reasonable and saving manner. You see it will be two or three weeks before we get word of what Mr. Becher's latest assay will be, and as we expect it will be a conclusive report I think it would be better if we wait for this before coming to a definite conclusion. You see if we get fresh capital we should do so under the most encouraging circumstances it is possible to do the above, and if we wait for Mr. Becher's assay it gives us more confidence it will profit the Company very considerably and it might help us to get the capital on the most favourable terms.

Mr. Ryrie.—Perhaps I misunderstood you, Mr. Chairman, but did you say he had not paid for machinery?

The Chairman.—He has got pumping machinery.

Mr. Ryrie.—How is it that there is such a large sum required to be spent on it?

Mr. Leigh.—I should say it must be a very small amount to send down a pump that would give him a fifty feet lift instead of a thirty feet.

Mr. Leigh.—But he requires steam power for the present pump.

The Chairman.—Only a very small boiler. It is a six-horse boiler, and you will never work such a pump as he wants on it. We directors here of course can't tell the moment these things are required, we have got to wait till we are asked. It was indicated six months ago that if we wanted to get a good heavy pump of six or eight inches diameter.

Mr. Leigh.—How about the water wheel, is it doing nothing now?

The Chairman.—Yes, and I am afraid it will remain doing nothing. Mr. Stewart ordered it on his own responsibility without any reference to us at all and he did not

even take the trouble to measure the height of his workings for it. Of course if we had ordered this pumping machinery we should have had it now. It is required but it would require also to be paid for.

Mr. Legge.—You have got \$3,000 lots, I think, and the expense runs to six thousand a month. I think we had better run six months without the pump and see what comes of it. We heard nothing about the pump before. I think you mentioned the subject of fresh capital, but in the imminent future what are you going to do?

The Chairman.—Yes, but in the meantime he suggests the purchase of this pump. There is no necessity for immediate capital.

Mr. Legge.—What is to be done with the six thousand a month?

The Chairman.—Well, it is costing six thousand a month now.

Mr. Legge.—Is it not us going on without that pump?

The Chairman.—I dare say it is, but it is probably a good deal of waste taking poor stuff until he has got down deeper. You see what the man says as plainly as I do.

Mr. Coughtrie.—It seems to me the money will now be to get samples of still better quartz by carefully following and selecting the veins which are known to be richest, and whilst we are doing this it will be advisable to keep the mill shut down for a few weeks.

The Chairman.—The Chinese take the few gold and we get a share of it, a portion of which in a small nugget here to begin with (about a nugget of gold).

Our object will now be to get samples of still better quartz by carefully following and selecting the veins which are known to be richest, and whilst we are doing this it will be advisable to keep the mill shut down for a few weeks.

Mr. Legge.—Well, if you can do it with the capital we have in hand.

The Chairman.—Not with the capital we have in hand.

Mr. Legge.—But if we remit him this money, what if after we remit him there are no results?

The Chairman.—No results!

Mr. Legge.—Yes, then I suppose it will be fine.

The Chairman.—Well, I can't say I see any objection to what you say.

Mr. Coughtrie.—I presume the money will be spent during the next six months in testing the value of the deep workings?

The Chairman.—There are no deep workings at all, he can't follow them.

Mr. Woodin.—You can't go deeper with out a proper pump.

Mr. Gillies.—The mere question of the pump is not so very important as all that.

The Chairman.—If the shareholders wish Mr. Becher to go on in the way he is going, it will be necessary for them within the next six months to provide some more money, not necessarily much. Then he must be written to as to direct. If you think Mr. Becher ought to be written to do the best he can with the \$25,000 we can address him to that effect.

There is no doubt about it, it is quite simple. Some one remarked that \$100,000 could be issued. It is as provided for, and I may, I think, remark that its being required must have been in contemplation by the directors at first, for I don't suppose they would have made any such provision did they not expect that it would be wanted. It is wanted, now, under that provision we suggest it should be raised. It need not be raised immediately nor in large sums, and it need never reach \$100,000 for right I know. It is only thought right to mention this matter just now for consideration; it is not for decision just now at all. I think it would be best for a week or two. Their opinion will be ours; we have no wish to press the shareholders into any arrangement that we may think best. If all the questions in connection with this report are put I suppose that it shall be passed.

Mr. Roster seconded, and the motion was unanimously adopted.

Mr. E. L. Woodin was re-elected a director on the motion of Mr. Coughtrie, seconded by Mr. Gower.

Mr. Machado proposed the re-election of Mr. Brodie, which was seconded by Mr. Murray and unanimously agreed to.

The re-election of Mr. T. E. Davies was proposed by Mr. Stokes, seconded by Mr. Leigh and unanimously carried.

On the motion of Mr. R. Hall, seconded by Mr. Tomlin, Mr. F. Henderson and Mr. G. S. Coxon were re-appointed auditors.

Hon. P. Ryrie.—If a pump is required, you quite understand my question now?

You quite understand my question now?

Have you ever received information which leads you to think you will find opium on board?—I cannot answer that question.

Mr. Spinney.—The prosecution admits the witness who say the witness declines to give. If he declines to answer, it is on his own responsibility. He has not received orders to do so.

The Attorney General.—You perfectly understand that you decline to answer the question on your own responsibility? The head of your department states he has not given you any orders?

Witness.—Yes.

Did you receive any information as soon as you got on board?—I decline to answer. Do you have any responsibility?

Mr. Spinney.—I have not the slightest objection to the witness giving yes, if he does not an unlooked for thing. There are only 10 heads of stamps, no pumps there. No such plant was contemplated as a railway working plant. The money was lost in the past at least it need not be squandered in the future.

HONGKONG BIFLE ASSOCIATION.

The shooting for the 4th Spoon competition at 600 yards took place on Saturday, the 6th inst. With the exception of Capt. Sung, Fricker, the winner, the scoring of the other members was indifferent. Full scores are subjoined:

Col. Sergt. Fricker	3454545	30
C. H. C. Prichard	4201553	23
Mr. L. Woodin	2321905*	21
P.C. D. McLennan	2054512	21
C. P. W. Robertson	2544603	19
Sergt. Fowler	4223294	90
Mr. C. Ford	2043523	19
P. O. W. J. Warlock	2424002*	16
Inspectr. Quincy	2200453	16
Col. Sergt. Phillips	2020324	26
Mr. E. R. Johnson	2200934	14
Mr. W. C. Murray	2025003	13
Sergt. McDonald	0605232	12
Mr. F. Watson	0622420	11
C. P. C. MacNab	2023300	10
Mr. D. Wood	2200003	6
Lt. A. H. Lee, R.A.	0020 retired	—
Previous Winners handicapped 3 points.		
Total.		

* Carbines allowed 2 points.

THE CANTON CUSTOMS OFFICIALS AND RIVER STEAMERS.

CHARGE AGAINST THE CAPTAIN OF THE "FATHOM."

A Consular Court was held at Canton on Saturday for the purpose of dealing with a charge made at the instance of Mr. F. White, Commissioner of Customs, against Stephen William Goggins, master of the H. C. & M. S. B. Co.'s river steamer "Fathom." The charge was that, on the 18th September last, Captain Goggins did present or cause to be presented a written paper purporting to be a true manifest of this cargo on the vessel "Fathom," which was detained.

The Chairman.—It is not the pump that matters so much as the steam power. You can't work a fifty feet lift instead of a thirty feet.

Mr. Leigh.—But he requires steam power for the present pump.

The Chairman.—Only a very small boiler. It is a six-horse boiler, and you will never work such a pump as he wants on it. We directors here of course can't tell the moment these things are required, we have got to wait till we are asked. It was indicated six months ago that if we wanted to get a good heavy pump of six or eight inches diameter.

Mr. Leigh.—How about the water wheel, is it doing nothing now?

The Chairman.—Yes, and I am afraid it will remain doing nothing. Mr. Stewart ordered it on his own responsibility without any reference to us at all and he did not

say that he was an employee of H. C. & M. S. B. Co. or that he was on behalf of the Commissioner, Mr. F. W. White. He charged Capt. Goggins on the 18th September, of the cargo on board that steamer, thereby rendering himself liable to a penalty of Tls. 600. Before proceeding with his case he wished to know what was the proper course of procedure to be followed.

The Consul said that Mr. Spinney would call his witnesses and then sum up. The Attorney General would then follow with his case, and if after the defense was closed, Mr. Spinney wished to call rebutting evidence he would be permitted to do so, but he would not be allowed to make any comment on the case for the defense.

R. Lake Loft, boat officer in the Customs, said—On the morning of the 18th September, I boarded the "Fathom" at Canton, about 8.30 a.m. Before I reached the "Fathom" I had found the 16 tons which had been seized by Mr. White. I had no suspicion of the ballast tanks, I had no information, but I had received an intimation, I applied to have the ballast tanks opened, and in the after tank I found two packages each containing ten tons. The water in the tank was up to a man's breast. I informed the captain of the result of my search. I handed the tank over to Mr. Stokes, who is in charge of the ballast tanks.

Cross-examined by the Attorney General.—You say you did not receive information, but what is the distinction?

—Well, information you pay money for. I received the intimation from the tide water.

You mean by information, then, something you have to pay for from outside, and by intimation something received from another officer?—Yes.

What was the officer's name from whom you received the intimation?—Mr. May.

If anyone gave you the information it would go to him first?—Yes.

Does he pay for this information?—I do not know.

I had orders from him what to do?—Yes. I was instructed before I went on board that we were to make a search.

Was any impediment placed in the way of your searching the tanks?—None whatever.

Have you ever searched this tank before?—Not this particular one.

Why have you not searched it before?—That is for me to say.

Exactly, that is what I want you to say?—I cannot answer it. It has not suited me to search it before.

The Court then adjourned for an hour.

On reassembling Mr. Spinney said he wished to make a statement with regard to the continuous witness. Mr. White wished to apologize to the Court and was prepared now to answer the questions which he had previously declined to answer.

It never occurred to you before to search for this particular one?—I do not.

Have you been long in the service?—I have been in it for seventeen years.

And you have never found opium in the water tank before?—Yes, I have found it everywhere.

Then why have you never searched in this case?—It was not the same ship.

What is the difference?—Well, some people are not so artful as others. (Laughter.)

You do not think, then, in this case they are as artful as on board other ships?—There were never any marks on the tanks before.

What marks were there here?—It was wet all over and there were

which rendered it desirable for the captain to get away as quickly as possible, where cases had been settled and fines paid, cases settled informally before a Commissioner of Customs, where it was quite impossible for that Court to judge what the circumstances were which enabled the Customs to practise squeezing and had urged the shippers to submit to it. He submitted that it was possible that in many of these cases it had been more convenient for the captain to submit to some small fine rather than to take the trouble to test the matter, delaying his ship while he was fighting it out. These cases referred to were practically worthless for any legal purpose in that trial, and he would put very respectfully but clearly to the Court what the character of this prosecution was, what the grounds upon which it had been undertaken, and what the end was which the Customs were seeking to obtain. They had not proceeded upon a typical case of smuggling. They had not proceeded upon a case of substantial misrepresentation from which the Chinese Government or Customs had suffered any substantial or material injury. They came in that Court because they wanted to obtain a legal decision by a competent Court in criminal jurisdiction, which would place upon the Articles of that Treaty a construction which it was never intended they should carry. In this case the Article defining the offence with which the defendant was charged did not warrant any such construction as that which Mr. Spinney had particularly advised the Customs they might endeavour to enforce in that Court. He would now propose to deal with the two acts, the omission to put the dried fish on the manifest and the placing of fruit there, which was not among the cargo, with which the prosecution had endeavoured to bolster up the opium case. These two acts must be dealt with separately from the opium. He could not help submitting an illustration of what looked almost like a want of fairness, a want of bona fides on the part of the prosecution, that they had chosen to mix up two such very different cases as these two. He agreed with Mr. Spinney that for the purpose of this decision, one of the most important questions was, and he was now dealing entirely with the opium question, what is cargo? He took cargo to mean what cargo means in the understanding not only of shippers, because the provisions of this Treaty were in the right, and interest of all persons and all classes, but in the meaning that nine persons out of ten would attach to the word. He took his stand upon the meaning of the word as it was popularly understood, that which is shipped from one port to another in the ordinary course, that which a merchant ships or receives and which pays freight. He excluded from that definition a great many things which were yet carried on board. There would be ship's stores, which he did not suppose it was intended were carried as cargo. Then again there was passengers' baggage, which he apprehended must not be included in cargo. Therefore there might be many things on board ship which were not cargo and could not be included in the definition of cargo as popularly used. But a far more important question here was the meaning of the word "manifest." He could give no absolutely legal definition of the word. He could only refer to a well-known law dictionary's definition and the popular definition of the word. The following was the definition given in Wharton's Law Lexicon:—In commercial navigation, a document signed by the master, containing the name or names of the places where the goods on board have been laden, and the places for which they are respectively destined, the name and tonnage of the vessel, the name of the master, and the name of the place to which the vessel belongs; a particular account and description of all the packages on board, with the marks and numbers thereon, the goods contained in such packages, the names of the respective shippers and consignees, as far as such particulars are known to the master. Now there had been several Customs Acts, but in earlier and later editions the Customs Consolidation Act of 1876, in certain sections which had been referred to, from 50 to 54, dealt with the master as nearly as possible identically with the way it was dealt with by Article 37 of the Tientsin Treaty. It provided that the master should make a report within twenty-four hours after his arrival in port. It provided that failure to do so would subject him to a penalty of £100. It provided that if the master, if he made a false return, was liable to forfeit £100. The principal part to which he now referred was that which defined what the master was to do when he reported, and he would say that the scope of the construction of that was precisely the same as that which could be given to Article 37 of the Treaty. In the Treaty what the master had to give in his report was a full and true account of the particulars of cargo on board. If the treaty with Korea were referred to it would be found that the words were almost identical. The same would be found on referring to the provisions of the Treaty with Japan. The construction to put on these words in all the cases was, he submitted, that when a shipmaster arrived in port he should do certain things in a certain way to facilitate the action of the Customs in doing what it was their duty to do, but which was not the duty of the British trader to do in China. It was not contended that the master or the crew should take upon themselves to complete a scientific search such as might be expected from the officers of the Customs. That was not what might be presumed to be the intention of the authorities when they were making a treaty for facilitating the suppression of smuggling. That was not a fair construction of the Treaty having regard to what the parties had in view. He would venture to point out that, in dealing with this question of construction, whatever might be the meaning of the Treaty, whatever might be the construction which should be put upon it as between the English and Chinese powers, that Court in that action was bound to look upon the terms of the Article of the Treaty which defined the offence as it were a definition contained in an Act of Parliament. That Court must regard itself from one point of view as a Court exercising criminal jurisdiction. They did not ask for any consideration from the Customs. The defence stood strictly upon their rights, and asked for nothing more than a legal definition of the offence of which they were charged as that contained in the Act of Parliament. He submitted that the words "false declaration" must be taken in the sense in which false declaration is understood in other legal documents. It was necessary to show a guilty knowledge on the part of the person making the declaration. It was not sufficient to show that the declaration was false, it must be shown that there was a guilty knowledge. He would refer the Court to a case reported in "Cox's Criminal Cases," page 281, the case of *Re v. Wilson*. This was a case under an old statute of William III, which imposed a penalty on persons who were found in possession of naval stores or timber marked with a broad arrow. It was the contention of the prosecution in that case that the mere fact of defendants being found in possession of goods so marked was sufficient to convict him, but the Court held that it was necessary to show that he was in possession wilfully and knowingly. There was a similar case reported in "Cox's Criminal Cases," page 41, *Re v. Cohen*. This was a case under the same statute and under the same section, the being in possession of naval stores, marked with a broad arrow. It was held necessary to show that the defendant knew they were so marked. The next case was at page 471 of the same report. This was an offence under the same statute, and the decision was the same. These cases closely resembled in some respects the question they had before them. Another case to which he would refer the Court was that of *Hearn v. Gordon*, 2 Law Journal, Magistrate's cases p. 210. This was the case of a person charged with sending dangerous goods by railway. The Act of Parliament provided that any person sending or who caused to be sent by railway any aqua fortis or dangerous goods without distinctly marking such goods on the outside and giving proper notice of the same, was liable to a fine of £20. It was held that a guilty knowledge was necessary before the Act would be permitted. This was not a matter in which the Chinese Customs could have been there and make arrangements. They had come into that Court of Criminal Jurisdiction, a company, and it was for that Court to consider the criminal charge which had been brought against the defendant. There was no provision laid down therefore for dealing with cases of this kind. The Customs had brought a criminal charge against the defendant, and a stigma had been laid upon defendant, although the prosecutor stated that he was a man for whom he had the greatest respect. The proceedings being brought in that Court was a very strong measure, but the advantages and disadvantages of such a proceeding must now remain. It was certainly never intended by the Treaty to make punishable in such a Court as that the conduct of parties who had made some slight mistake which might happen to any man, however innocent he might be, and however zealous in assisting the Customs. There had never been anything suggested, there had been nothing brought before the Court to show that the Steamship Company or its employees had ever wished to interfere with the Customs or had done anything except give their best assistance in dealing with these matters; but they had been entangled into doing what they could not be entrapped into doing by the authority of the Commissioner of Customs, but at all events it seemed to him to be a desire to bring them through that Court a conviction which the prosecutor had secured. He could not help submitting an illustration of what looked almost like a want of fairness, a want of bona fides on the part of the prosecution, that they had chosen to mix up two such very different cases as these two. He agreed with Mr. Spinney that for the purpose of this decision, one of the most important questions was, and he was now dealing entirely with the opium question, what is cargo? He took cargo to mean what cargo means in the understanding not only of shippers, because the provisions of this Treaty were in the right, and interest of all persons and all classes, but in the meaning that nine persons out of ten would attach to the word. He took his stand upon the meaning of the word as it was popularly understood, that which is shipped from one port to another in the ordinary course, that which a merchant ships or receives and which pays freight. He excluded from that definition a great many things which were yet carried on board. There would be ship's stores, which he did not suppose it was intended were carried as cargo. Then again there was passengers' baggage, which he apprehended must not be included in cargo. Therefore there might be many things on board ship which were not cargo and could not be included in the definition of cargo as popularly used. But a far more important question here was the meaning of the word "manifest." He could give no absolutely legal definition of the word. He could only refer to a well-known law dictionary's definition and the popular definition of the word. The following was the definition given in Wharton's Law Lexicon:—In commercial navigation, a document signed by the master, containing the name or names of the places where the goods on board have been laden, and the places for which they are respectively destined, the name and tonnage of the vessel, the name of the master, and the name of the place to which the vessel belongs; a particular account and description of all the packages on board, with the marks and numbers thereon, the goods contained in such packages, the names of the respective shippers and consignees, as far as such particulars are known to the master. Now there had been several Customs Acts, but in earlier and later editions the Customs Consolidation Act of 1876, in certain sections which had been referred to, from 50 to 54, dealt with the master as nearly as possible identically with the way it was dealt with by Article 37 of the Tientsin Treaty. It provided that the master should make a report within twenty-four hours after his arrival in port. It provided that failure to do so would subject him to a penalty of £100. It provided that if the master, if he made a false return, was liable to forfeit £100. The principal part to which he now referred was that which defined what the master was to do when he reported, and he would say that the scope of the construction of that was precisely the same as that which could be given to Article 37 of the Treaty. In the Treaty what the master had to give in his report was a full and true account of the particulars of cargo on board. If the treaty with Korea were referred to it would be found that the words were almost identical. The same would be found on referring to the provisions of the Treaty with Japan. The construction to put on these words in all the cases was, he submitted, that when a shipmaster arrived in port he should do certain things in a certain way to facilitate the action of the Customs in doing what it was their duty to do, but which was not the duty of the British trader to do in China. It was not contended that the master or the crew should take upon themselves to complete a scientific search such as might be expected from the officers of the Customs. That was not what might be presumed to be the intention of the authorities when they were making a treaty for facilitating the suppression of smuggling. That was not a fair construction of the Treaty having regard to what the parties had in view. He would venture to point out that, in dealing with this question of construction, whatever might be the meaning of the Treaty, whatever might be the construction which should be put upon it as between the English and Chinese powers, that Court in that action was bound to look upon the terms of the Article of the Treaty which defined the offence as it were a definition contained in an Act of Parliament. That Court must regard itself from one point of view as a Court exercising criminal jurisdiction. They did not ask for any consideration from the Customs. The defence stood strictly upon their rights, and asked for nothing more than a legal definition of the offence of which they were charged as that contained in the Act of Parliament. He submitted that the words "false declaration" must be taken in the sense in which false declaration is understood in other legal documents. It was necessary to show a guilty knowledge on the part of the person making the declaration. It was not sufficient to show that the declaration was false, it must be shown that there was a guilty knowledge. He would refer the Court to a case reported in "Cox's Criminal Cases," page 281, the case of *Re v. Wilson*. This was a case under an old statute of William III, which imposed a penalty on persons who were found in possession of naval stores or timber marked with a broad arrow. It was the contention of the prosecution in that case that the mere fact of defendants being found in possession of goods so marked was sufficient to convict him, but the Court held that it was necessary to show that he was in possession wilfully and knowingly. There was a similar case reported in "Cox's Criminal Cases," page 41, *Re v. Cohen*. This was a case under the same statute and under the same section, the being in possession of naval stores, marked with a broad arrow. It was held necessary to show that the defendant knew they were so marked. The next case was at page 471 of the same report. This was an offence under the same statute, and the decision was the same. These cases closely resembled in some respects the question they had before them. Another case to which he would refer the Court was that of *Hearn v. Gordon*, 2 Law Journal, Magistrate's cases p. 210. This was the case of a person charged with sending dangerous goods by railway. The Act of Parliament provided that any person sending or who caused to be sent by railway any aqua fortis or dangerous goods without distinctly marking such goods on the outside and giving proper notice of the same, was liable to a fine of £20. It was held that a guilty knowledge was necessary before the Act would be permitted. This was not a matter in which the Chinese Customs could have been there and make arrangements. They had come into that Court of Criminal Jurisdiction, a company, and it was for that Court to consider the criminal charge which had been brought against the defendant. There was no provision laid down therefore for dealing with cases of this kind. The Customs had brought a criminal charge against the defendant, and a stigma had been laid upon defendant, although the prosecutor stated that he was a man for whom he had the greatest respect. The proceedings being brought in that Court was a very strong measure, but the advantages and disadvantages of such a proceeding must now remain. It was certainly never intended by the Treaty to make punishable in such a Court as that the conduct of parties who had made some slight mistake which might happen to any man, however innocent he might be, and however zealous in assisting the Customs. There had never been anything suggested, there had been nothing brought before the Court to show that the Steamship Company or its employees had ever wished to interfere with the Customs or had done anything except give their best assistance in dealing with these matters; but they had been entangled into doing what they could not be entrapped into doing by the authority of the Commissioner of Customs, but at all events it seemed to him to be a desire to bring them through that Court a conviction which the prosecutor had secured. He could not help submitting an illustration of what looked almost like a want of fairness, a want of bona fides on the part of the prosecution, that they had chosen to mix up two such very different cases as these two. He agreed with Mr. Spinney that for the purpose of this decision, one of the most important questions was, and he was now dealing entirely with the opium question, what is cargo? He took cargo to mean what cargo means in the understanding not only of shippers, because the provisions of this Treaty were in the right, and interest of all persons and all classes, but in the meaning that nine persons out of ten would attach to the word. He took his stand upon the meaning of the word as it was popularly understood, that which is shipped from one port to another in the ordinary course, that which a merchant ships or receives and which pays freight. He excluded from that definition a great many things which were yet carried on board. There would be ship's stores, which he did not suppose it was intended were carried as cargo. Then again there was passengers' baggage, which he apprehended must not be included in cargo. Therefore there might be many things on board ship which were not cargo and could not be included in the definition of cargo as popularly used. But a far more important question here was the meaning of the word "manifest." He could give no absolutely legal definition of the word. He could only refer to a well-known law dictionary's definition and the popular definition of the word. The following was the definition given in Wharton's Law Lexicon:—In commercial navigation, a document signed by the master, containing the name or names of the places where the goods on board have been laden, and the places for which they are respectively destined, the name and tonnage of the vessel, the name of the master, and the name of the place to which the vessel belongs; a particular account and description of all the packages on board, with the marks and numbers thereon, the goods contained in such packages, the names of the respective shippers and consignees, as far as such particulars are known to the master. Now there had been several Customs Acts, but in earlier and later editions the Customs Consolidation Act of 1876, in certain sections which had been referred to, from 50 to 54, dealt with the master as nearly as possible identically with the way it was dealt with by Article 37 of the Tientsin Treaty. It provided that the master should make a report within twenty-four hours after his arrival in port. It provided that failure to do so would subject him to a penalty of £100. It provided that if the master, if he made a false return, was liable to forfeit £100. The principal part to which he now referred was that which defined what the master was to do when he reported, and he would say that the scope of the construction of that was precisely the same as that which could be given to Article 37 of the Treaty. In the Treaty what the master had to give in his report was a full and true account of the particulars of cargo on board. If the treaty with Korea were referred to it would be found that the words were almost identical. The same would be found on referring to the provisions of the Treaty with Japan. The construction to put on these words in all the cases was, he submitted, that when a shipmaster arrived in port he should do certain things in a certain way to facilitate the action of the Customs in doing what it was their duty to do, but which was not the duty of the British trader to do in China. It was not contended that the master or the crew should take upon themselves to complete a scientific search such as might be expected from the officers of the Customs. That was not what might be presumed to be the intention of the authorities when they were making a treaty for facilitating the suppression of smuggling. That was not a fair construction of the Treaty having regard to what the parties had in view. He would venture to point out that, in dealing with this question of construction, whatever might be the meaning of the Treaty, whatever might be the construction which should be put upon it as between the English and Chinese powers, that Court in that action was bound to look upon the terms of the Article of the Treaty which defined the offence as it were a definition contained in an Act of Parliament. That Court must regard itself from one point of view as a Court exercising criminal jurisdiction. They did not ask for any consideration from the Customs. The defence stood strictly upon their rights, and asked for nothing more than a legal definition of the offence of which they were charged as that contained in the Act of Parliament. He submitted that the words "false declaration" must be taken in the sense in which false declaration is understood in other legal documents. It was necessary to show a guilty knowledge on the part of the person making the declaration. It was not sufficient to show that the declaration was false, it must be shown that there was a guilty knowledge. He would refer the Court to a case reported in "Cox's Criminal Cases," page 281, the case of *Re v. Wilson*. This was a case under an old statute of William III, which imposed a penalty on persons who were found in possession of naval stores or timber marked with a broad arrow. It was the contention of the prosecution in that case that the mere fact of defendants being found in possession of goods so marked was sufficient to convict him, but the Court held that it was necessary to show that he was in possession wilfully and knowingly. There was a similar case reported in "Cox's Criminal Cases," page 41, *Re v. Cohen*. This was a case under the same statute and under the same section, the being in possession of naval stores, marked with a broad arrow. It was held necessary to show that the defendant knew they were so marked. The next case was at page 471 of the same report. This was an offence under the same statute, and the decision was the same. These cases closely resembled in some respects the question they had before them. Another case to which he would refer the Court was that of *Hearn v. Gordon*, 2 Law Journal, Magistrate's cases p. 210. This was the case of a person charged with sending dangerous goods by railway. The Act of Parliament provided that any person sending or who caused to be sent by railway any aqua fortis or dangerous goods without distinctly marking such goods on the outside and giving proper notice of the same, was liable to a fine of £20. It was held that a guilty knowledge was necessary before the Act would be permitted. This was not a matter in which the Chinese Customs could have been there and make arrangements. They had come into that Court of Criminal Jurisdiction, a company, and it was for that Court to consider the criminal charge which had been brought against the defendant. There was no provision laid down therefore for dealing with cases of this kind. The Customs had brought a criminal charge against the defendant, and a stigma had been laid upon defendant, although the prosecutor stated that he was a man for whom he had the greatest respect. The proceedings being brought in that Court was a very strong measure, but the advantages and disadvantages of such a proceeding must now remain. It was certainly never intended by the Treaty to make punishable in such a Court as that the conduct of parties who had made some slight mistake which might happen to any man, however innocent he might be, and however zealous in assisting the Customs. There had never been anything suggested, there had been nothing brought before the Court to show that the Steamship Company or its employees had ever wished to interfere with the Customs or had done anything except give their best assistance in dealing with these matters; but they had been entangled into doing what they could not be entrapped into doing by the authority of the Commissioner of Customs, but at all events it seemed to him to be a desire to bring them through that Court a conviction which the prosecutor had secured. He could not help submitting an illustration of what looked almost like a want of fairness, a want of bona fides on the part of the prosecution, that they had chosen to mix up two such very different cases as these two. He agreed with Mr. Spinney that for the purpose of this decision, one of the most important questions was, and he was now dealing entirely with the opium question, what is cargo? He took cargo to mean what cargo means in the understanding not only of shippers, because the provisions of this Treaty were in the right, and interest of all persons and all classes, but in the meaning that nine persons out of ten would attach to the word. He took his stand upon the meaning of the word as it was popularly understood, that which is shipped from one port to another in the ordinary course, that which a merchant ships or receives and which pays freight. He excluded from that definition a great many things which were yet carried on board. There would be ship's stores, which he did not suppose it was intended were carried as cargo. Then again there was passengers' baggage, which he apprehended must not be included in cargo. Therefore there might be many things on board ship which were not cargo and could not be included in the definition of cargo as popularly used. But a far more important question here was the meaning of the word "manifest." He could give no absolutely legal definition of the word. He could only refer to a well-known law dictionary's definition and the popular definition of the word. The following was the definition given in Wharton's Law Lexicon:—In commercial navigation, a document signed by the master, containing the name or names of the places where the goods on board have been laden, and the places for which they are respectively destined, the name and tonnage of the vessel, the name of the master, and the name of the place to which the vessel belongs; a particular account and description of all the packages on board, with the marks and numbers thereon, the goods contained in such packages, the names of the respective shippers and consignees, as far as such particulars are known to the master. Now there had been several Customs Acts, but in earlier and later editions the Customs Consolidation Act of 1876, in certain sections which had been referred to, from 50 to 54, dealt with the master as nearly as possible identically with the way it was dealt with by Article 37 of the Tientsin Treaty. It provided that the master should make a report within twenty-four hours after his arrival in port. It provided that failure to do so would subject him to a penalty of £100. It provided that if the master, if he made a false return, was liable to forfeit £100. The principal part to which he now referred was that which defined what the master was to do when he reported, and he would say that the scope of the construction of that was precisely the same as that which could be given to Article 37 of the Treaty. In the Treaty what the master had to give in his report was a full and true account of the particulars of cargo on board. If the treaty with Korea were referred to it would be found that the words were almost identical. The same would be found on referring to the provisions of the Treaty with Japan. The construction to put on these words in all the cases was, he submitted, that when a shipmaster arrived in port he should do certain things in a certain way to facilitate the action of the Customs in doing what it was their duty to do, but which was not the duty of the British trader to do in China. It was not contended that the master or the crew should take upon themselves to complete a scientific search such as might be expected from the officers of the Customs. That was not what might be presumed to be the intention of the authorities when they were making a treaty for facilitating the suppression of smuggling. That was not a fair construction of the Treaty having regard to what the parties had in view. He would venture to point out that, in dealing with this question of construction, whatever might be the meaning of the Treaty, whatever might be the construction which should be put upon it as between the English and Chinese powers, that Court in that action was bound to look upon the terms of the Article of the Treaty which defined the offence as it were a definition contained in an Act of Parliament. That Court must regard itself from one point of view as a Court exercising criminal jurisdiction. They did not ask for any consideration from the Customs. The defence stood strictly upon their rights, and asked for nothing more than a legal definition of the offence of which they were charged as that contained in the Act of Parliament. He submitted that the words "false declaration" must be taken in the sense in which false declaration is understood in other legal documents. It was necessary to show a guilty knowledge on the part of the person making the declaration. It was not sufficient to show that the declaration was false, it must be shown that there was a guilty knowledge. He would refer the Court to a case reported in "Cox's Criminal Cases," page 281, the case of *Re v. Wilson*. This was a case under an old statute of William III, which imposed a penalty on persons who were found in possession of naval stores or timber marked with a broad arrow. It was the contention of the prosecution in that case that the mere fact of defendants being found in possession of goods so marked was sufficient to convict him, but the Court held that it was necessary to show that he was in possession wilfully and knowingly. There was a similar case reported in "Cox's Criminal Cases," page 41, *Re v. Cohen*. This was a case under the same statute and under the same section, the being in possession of naval stores, marked with a broad arrow. It was held necessary to show that the defendant knew they were so marked. The next case was at page 471 of the same report. This was an offence under the same statute, and the decision was the same. These cases closely resembled in some respects the question they had before them. Another case to which he would refer the Court was that of *Hearn v. Gordon*, 2 Law Journal, Magistrate's cases p. 210. This was the case of a person charged with sending dangerous goods by railway. The Act of Parliament provided that any person sending or who caused to be sent by railway any aqua fortis or dangerous goods without distinctly marking such goods on the outside and giving proper notice of the same, was liable to a fine of £20. It was held that a guilty knowledge was necessary before the Act would be permitted. This was not a matter in which the Chinese Customs could have been there and make arrangements. They had come into that Court of Criminal Jurisdiction, a company, and it was for that Court to consider the criminal charge which had been brought against the defendant. There was no provision laid down therefore for dealing with cases of this kind. The Customs had brought a criminal charge against the defendant, and a stigma had been laid upon defendant, although the prosecutor stated that he was a man for whom he had the greatest respect. The proceedings being brought in that Court was a very strong measure, but the advantages and disadvantages of such a proceeding must now remain. It was certainly never intended by the Treaty to make punishable in such a Court as that the conduct of parties who had made some slight mistake which might happen to any man, however innocent he might be, and however zealous in assisting the Customs. There had never been anything suggested, there had been nothing brought before the Court to show that the Steamship Company or its employees had ever wished to interfere with the Customs or had done anything except give their best assistance in dealing with these matters; but they had been entangled into doing what they could not be entrapped into doing by the authority of the Commissioner of Customs, but at all events it seemed to him to be a desire to bring them through that Court a conviction which the prosecutor had secured. He could not help submitting an illustration of what looked almost like a want of fairness, a want of bona fides on the part of the prosecution, that they had chosen to mix up two such very different cases as these two. He agreed with Mr. Spinney that for the purpose of this decision, one of the most important questions was, and he was now dealing entirely with the opium question, what is cargo? He took cargo to mean what cargo means in the understanding not only of shippers, because the provisions of this Treaty were in the right, and interest of all persons and all classes, but in the meaning that nine persons out of ten would attach to the word. He took his stand upon the meaning of the word as it was popularly understood, that which is shipped from one port to another in the ordinary course, that which a merchant ships or receives and which pays freight. He excluded from that definition a great many things which were yet carried on board. There would be ship's stores, which he did not suppose it was intended were carried as cargo. Then again there was passengers' baggage, which he apprehended must not be included in cargo. Therefore there might be many things on board ship which were not cargo and could not be included in the definition of cargo as popularly used. But a far more important question here was the meaning of the word "manifest." He could give no absolutely legal definition of the word. He could only refer to a well-known law dictionary's definition and the popular definition of the word. The following was the definition given in Wharton's Law Lexicon:—In commercial navigation, a document signed by the master, containing the name or names of the places where the goods on board have been laden, and the places for which they are respectively destined, the name and tonnage of the vessel, the name of the master, and the name of the place to which the vessel belongs; a particular account and description of all the packages on board, with the marks and numbers thereon, the goods contained in such packages, the names of the respective shippers and consignees, as far as such particulars are known to the master. Now there had been several Customs Acts, but in earlier and later editions the Customs Consolidation Act of 1876, in certain sections which had been referred to, from 50 to 54, dealt with the master as nearly as possible identically with the way it was dealt with by Article 37 of the Tientsin Treaty. It provided that the master should make a report within twenty-four hours after his arrival in port. It provided that failure to do so would subject him to a penalty of £100. It provided that if the master, if he made a false return, was liable to forfeit £100. The principal part to which he now referred was that which defined what the master was to do when he reported, and he would say that the scope of the construction of that was precisely the same as that which could be given to Article 37